



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,746	02/28/2002	Travis J. Parry	10012900-1	8769

7590 07/18/2007
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

LASHLEY, LAUREL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/086,746

Applicant(s)

PARRY, TRAVIS J.

Examiner

Laurel Lashley

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-12,15-17,20-21,24-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-12,15-17,20-21,24-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/30/2007 has been entered. Therefore claims 1, 5 – 12, 15 – 17, 20 – 21, 24 – 29 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5 – 12, 15 – 17, 20 – 21 and 26 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rouke et al. in US Patent No. 5077795 (hereinafter US '795) further in view of Docter et al. in US Patent No. 6330610 (hereinafter US '610).

As it relates to claim 1, and similar claims 11 and 20, US '795 teaches:

A printing system, comprising: (see Figure 1)

a printer including:

a processor; and

a printing component in communication with said processor (see column 3, lines 33 - 38); and

but does not expressly disclose:

Art Unit: 2132

a filtering program stored in a memory device or firmware of said printer and associated with said processor so as to control printing of a file by said printing component based on at least one prespecified characteristic from a packet including said file,

wherein if said at least one prespecified characteristics is an undesirable characteristic processing of said file is terminated, and

wherein if said at a least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic processing of said file proceeds.

Docter et al. however in US '610 does disclose a filtering program stored in a memory device or firmware of said printer and associated with said processor (see Figure 10 and column 9, lines 51 – 65) so as to control printing of a file by said printing component based on at least one prespecified characteristic from a packet including said file, (see Figure 11; column 1, line 66: a system for filtering data; column 10, line 10 – column 11, lines 1 – 7)

wherein if said at least one prespecified characteristics is an undesirable characteristic processing of said file is terminated, (see column 2, line 2: first filter criteria) and

wherein if said at a least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic processing of said file proceeds. (see column 2, line 5: second filter criteria).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing system of Rourke et al. such that it would incorporated a filtering program as in Docter et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide security to printing devices.

For claim 5, and similar claims 12 and 26, US '795 teaches the printing system of claim 1 *but does not expressly disclose*, wherein said at least one prespecified characteristic comprises at least one of a file type, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, a

Art Unit: 2132

password, time of transmission, cumulative number of files sent by a user, cumulative number of files sent by a user over a given time, file string, and time-consuming print commands.

Docter et al. however in US '610 does disclose wherein said at least one prespecified characteristic comprises at least one of a file type, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, a password, time of transmission, cumulative number of files sent by a user, cumulative number of files sent by a user over a given time, file string, and time-consuming print commands. (see column 3, lines 30 – 40: any number of filtering parameters or attributes may be used to filter data).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing system of Rourke et al. such that it would incorporated a filtering program with filtering guidelines as in Docter et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide security to printing devices by identifying characteristics that are undesirable for printing.

For claim 6, US '795 teaches the printing system of claim 1, *but does not expressly disclose* wherein said filtering program causes said processor to prevent said printing component from printing a file of a packet having at least one said undesirable characteristic.

Docter et al. however does disclose wherein said filtering program causes said processor to prevent said printing component from printing a file of a packet having at least one said undesirable characteristic (see column 10, lines 32 – 33: where filtering is based on data received; and column 2, lines 14 – 15: where the profile data set contains elements associated with particular class of recipients).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing system of Rourke et al. such that it would incorporated a filtering program with filtering guidelines as in Docter et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide security to printing devices by identifying characteristics that are undesirable for printing.

Art Unit: 2132

For claim 7, US '795 teaches the printing system of claim 1, *but does not expressly disclose* wherein said filtering program instructs said processor to cause said printing component to print a file of a packet having said desirable characteristic.

Docter however does disclose wherein said filtering program instructs said processor to cause said printing component to print a file of a packet having said desirable characteristic (see column 10, line 62: where filter data processing code determines the destination of packet).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing system of Rourke et al. such that it would incorporated a filtering program with filtering guidelines as in Docter et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide security to printing devices by identifying characteristics that are undesirable for printing.

For claim 8, and similar claims 15 and 28, US '795 teaches the printing system of claim 1, *but does not expressly disclose* wherein said filtering program instructs said processor to cause said printing component to print said file only if said packet lacks said undesirable characteristic and has said desirable characteristic.

Docter however does disclose wherein said filtering program instructs said processor to cause said printing component to print said file only if said packet lacks said undesirable characteristic and has said desirable characteristic (column 3, line 17: where unwanted data is eliminated).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing system of Rourke et al. such that it would incorporated a filtering program with filtering guidelines as in Docter et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide security to printing devices by identifying characteristics that are undesirable for printing.

For claim 9, and similar claim 16, US '795 teaches the printing system of claim 1, *but does not expressly disclose* wherein said undesirable characteristic comprises one of a file type,

Art Unit: 2132

a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command.

Docter however does disclose wherein said undesirable characteristic comprises one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command (column 2, line 2; and column 3, lines 34 – 40: criteria designated within specified criteria).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing system of Rourke et al. such that it would incorporated a filtering program with filtering guidelines as in Docter et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide security to printing devices by identifying characteristics that are undesirable for printing.

For claim 10, and similar claim 17, US '795 teaches the printing system of claim 1, *but does not expressly disclose* wherein said desirable characteristic comprises one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password.

Docter however does disclose wherein said desirable characteristic comprises one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password (column 2, line 5; and column 3, lines 34 – 40).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing system of Rourke et al. such that it would incorporated a filtering program with filtering guidelines as in Docter et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide security to printing devices by identifying characteristics that are suitable for printing.

For claim 21, US '795 teaches the system of claim 20, and a memory device and firmware (see Figure 1) *but does not expressly disclose* wherein said filtering program is stored by at least one of a memory device and firmware.

Art Unit: 2132

Docter however does disclose wherein said filtering program is stored by at least one of a memory device and firmware (see column 3, lines 20 – 22).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing system of Rourke et al. such that it would incorporated a filtering program with filtering guidelines as in Docter et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide security to printing devices.

For claim 27, US '795 discloses the system of claim 20, includes instructions for said printer, the instructions comprising information about a source of media onto which printing of said at least one file is to be effected, information about orientation in which said at least one file is to be printed on a media, information about whether printing is to be effected on one or two sides of a media, information about a number of copies to be printed, or information about whether multiple copies should be collated (see Figure 1 and associated text: where these instructions are inherent features of a printing system).

3. Claims 24 – 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rourke et al. in US Patent No. 5077795 (hereinafter US '795) and Docter et al. in US Patent No. 6330610 (hereinafter US '610) further in view of Kawamura in US Patent No. 5731882 (hereinafter US '882).

For claim 24 and similar claims 25 and 29, US '795 teaches the printing system of claim 1, *but does not expressly disclose* wherein a message is generated if processing of said file is terminated.

Kawamura however in US '882 does disclose wherein a message is generated if processing of said file is terminated. (see column 9, lines 45 – 58: message "printer error"...))

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing system of Rourke et al. such that it would incorporate a filtering program

Art Unit: 2132

as in Docter et al. such that if printing of a file was prevented, a message would be generated to inform the user as in Kawamura. The motivation for doing so would have been to alert the user of a printing error.


Conclusion


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurel Lashley whose telephone number is 571-272-0693. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, alt Fridays btw 7:30 am & 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laurel Lashley
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

 13 July 2007
LLL


Benjamin E. Lanier
Examiner AU 2132